

## **REMARKS**

Applicant wishes to sincerely thank the Examiner for her thorough examination of the application. This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action and includes claim language which the Examiner may be patentable. No new matter is added. Authorization is given to charge any deficiencies or credit any over payments to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

### **I. Request for Extension of Time and Fees**

This response to office action is filed with a request for a two month extension of time and a check for the necessary fees is included herewith.

### **II. The Amendments address the Claim Objections**

The Office Action objected to claims 1-5, 18, 20, 24, and 25 for informalities. These claims have been amended to address the informalities and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

### **III. New Matter Rejection**

The Office Action asserted that new matter was entered in the claim amendments of October 19, 2004. Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion, the amendments contained herein have removed the rejected language. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

### **IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action asserted that claims 17-34 failed to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees, the amendments contained herein have removed the rejected language. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

### **V. Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action indicated that claims 1-16 are allowed.

**VI. Rejections on Art**

The Office Action rejected 17-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103. More specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 17, 18, 21 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tochikubo et al. (U.S. 5,840,037) in view of Hon et al. (U.S. 4,993,422) and Forstner (U.S. 6,231,517). The Office Action also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tochikubo in view of Hon and Forstner and further in view of Chesney et al. (U.S. 6,132,383). Also, the Office Action rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tochikubo in view of Hon and Forstner and rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tochikubo in view of Hon and Forstner and further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. 5,170,796). Additionally, the Office Action rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Tochikubo in view of Hon, Forstner, and Kobayashi and further in view of Eckerle (U.S. 4,799,491). Finally, the Office Action rejected claims 17, 18, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Penaz (U.S. 4,869,261) in view of Hon and Forstner.

**VII. Independent Claim 17 is Patentable Over the Cited References**

The Applicant has amended independent claim 17 to recite language that the Examiner commented favorable on in the Examiner interview on 16 February 2005 and that the Examiner indicated as allowable in the office action dated 10 February 2004.

Amended claim 17 now recites a wrist holding device including a support board, wherein the support board is shaped to adapt to a flexing angle of between approximately 100 and 170 degrees between a dorsal side of the wrist and a dorsal side of a hand attached to the wrist. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, for example at ¶ 34, Pub. App. 20020026121. The support board is also shaped to adapt to a turning angle of between approximately 30 and 100 degrees of the wrist relative to the forearm attached to the wrist towards a medial side of the patient's body. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, for example at ¶ 35, Pub. App. 20020026121.

The Applicant respectfully submits that none of these references discussed above, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest an apparatus as recited in claim 17.

Accordingly, claim 17 is believed to be allowable. Also, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependence on allowable base claim 17 and for further features recited therein.

### **VIII. Support for Amendments to Dependent Claims**

Claim 19 now recites that the support board is shaped to further adapt to a deflecting angle from a control line of the palm of the hand relative to a central line of the volar side of the wrist at between approximately 10 and 40 degrees towards the little finger of the hand. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, for example at ¶ 35, Pub. App. 20020026121.

Claim 20 now recites that the support board includes an inner surface adapted to face the skin of the wrist and an outer surface opposite to the inner surface. The inner surface is shaped to adept to at least the shape of the irregular surface of the dorsal side of the flexing wrist joint, and a potion of the outer surface is adapted to cover at least the dorsal side of the flexing joint and is shaped to regular column surface. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, for example at Fig. 2, Fig. 3, Fig. 5(a) and ¶ 48, Pub. App. 20020026121.

Claim 25 now recites that the values of the bladder pressures when the amplitude of the pulse wave signals detected by the optimal transducer are respectively close to maximum and disappearance are respectively lower than the values of the bladder pressures when the amplitudes of the pulse wave signals detected synchronously by other transducers of the selected column of transducers are respectively close to maximum and disappearance. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, for example at ¶¶ 37-39, Pub. App. 20020026121.

### **IX. Conclusion**


Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the cited references, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the

foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**AKERMAN SENTERFITT**

Date: 3-29-05



---

Joseph W. Bain, Reg. No. 34,290  
Mark D. Passler, Reg. No. 40,764  
Customer No. 30448  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Tel: (561) 653-5000

Docket No. 9500-1